

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 17-20, 22-33 and 35-54 are pending in the application, with claims 17, 30 and 43 being the independent claims.

Based on the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 17-23, 25-33, 35-37, 39-45 and 47-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,186,629 to Rohen (“the Rohen patent”).

Independent Claim 17

Independent claim 17 recites “a resilient material coupled to said housing, said resilient material configured to enable said delivery of said tactile sensation by storing and releasing energy.”

The Rohen patent discloses a computer mouse that includes a tactile-feedback transducer located adjacent an opening in the housing. The transducer is disclosed as either a conductive area within the housing opening that provides an AC signal to the user or a vibrator/sound transducer that provides vibration and sound to the user through the housing opening.

The Rohen patent fails to disclose “a resilient material coupled to said housing, said resilient material configured to enable said delivery of said tactile sensation by storing and releasing energy” as recited in independent claim 17. In fact, the Rohen patent fails to disclose any resilient material whatsoever. Accordingly, independent claim 17 is allowable over the cited reference.

Independent Claim 30

Independent claim 30 recites “a resilient material coupled to said housing, said resilient material configured to enable the output of said tactile sensation by storing and releasing energy.”

The Rohen patent fails to disclose “a resilient material coupled to said housing, said resilient material configured to enable the output of said tactile sensation by storing and releasing energy” as recited in independent claim 30. As discussed above, the Rohen patent fails to disclose any resilient material whatsoever. Accordingly, independent claim 30 is allowable over the cited reference.

Independent Claim 43

The Office Action is silent with respect to the merits of independent claim 43. The Examiner suggests that claim 43 corresponds to “the apparatus claims” without further comment. In fact, independent claim 43 contains different elements than those present in the independent apparatus claims 17 and 30.

Independent claim 43 recites “generating a movement of a casing portion of said mouse device with respect to a bottom portion of said mouse device in response to said received sensory feedback signal.”

The mouse device disclosed in the Rohen patent includes a continuous housing, with the upper part of the housing being fixed with respect to the lower part of the housing. No part of the housing of the mouse device disclosed in the Rohen patent moves with respect to another portion of the housing. The Rohen patent does not disclose or suggest “generating a movement of a casing portion of said mouse device with respect to a bottom portion of said mouse device in

response to said received sensory feedback signal.” Accordingly, independent claim 43 is allowable over the cited reference.

Dependent Claims

Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 17, 30 or 43, dependent claims 18-20, 22-23, 25-29, 31-33, 35-37, 39-42, 44-45 and 47-54 are allowable over the cited reference. The rejection of claim 21 is obviated by the cancellation of that claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 24, 38 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rohen patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,868,549 to Affinito et al. (“the Affinito patent”). Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 17, 30 and 43, which are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above, dependent claims 24, 38 and 46 are also allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 12, 2003

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656
Tel: (703) 456-8000
Fax: (703) 456-8100

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887